

In this case, “Defendant’s Motion For Summary Judgment” (Document No. 9) and “Answer” (Document No. 10) were filed on May 12, 2016. On May 26, 2016, Plaintiff filed his own “Motion For Summary Judgment” (Document No. 12). These pending dispositive motions

are now ripe for disposition, and will be determined by the presiding District Judge, the Honorable Robert J. Conrad, Jr., in due course.

The parties filed their “Certification And Report Of F.R.C.P. 26(f) Conference And Proposed Discovery Plan” (Document No. 15) on June 1, 2016. The parties’ filing proposes limited discovery, but also states that the parties expect this matter to be resolved by cross motions for summary judgment. (Document No. 15). To date, the Court has not entered a “Pretrial Order And Case Management Plan.”

The undersigned notes that the Local Rules of this Court allow for “consensual discovery at any time,” but “Court enforceable discovery does not commence until the issues have joined and a Scheduling Order is entered.” Local Rule 16.1(F). Pursuant to the Local Rules, it is unclear that the pending “Motion To Stay...” is necessary; nevertheless, the undersigned will grant the motion. As such, Defendant will not be required to participate in discovery prior to entry of a “Pretrial Order And Case Management Plan,” which will most likely be issued, if at all, following disposition of the parties’ cross motions for summary judgment.

**IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED** that Defendant’s “Motion To Stay Discovery Or, In The Alternative, For Rule 26(c)(1) Protective Order” (Document No. 24) is **GRANTED**, as **described herein**.

**SO ORDERED.**

Signed: August 8, 2016

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
David C. Keesler  
United States Magistrate Judge

